

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 11 and 19 have been amended. Claims 11-21 are pending and under consideration.

To address the Examiner's objection to the drawings, replacement drawings are being filed herewith.

Claims 11-21 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over US Patent No. 5,719,921 to Vysotsky et al., in view of US Patent No. 5,581,600 to Watts et al.

Vysotsky et al. discloses a system for activating telephone services in response to speech, in which a speaker dependent and a speaker independent speech recognition are performed in parallel. See col. 7, lines 34-37. The outputs of both the speaker dependent and the speaker independent speech recognition units are supplied to the input of an arbitration step. The arbitration step is used to arbitrate between the results of the two speech recognition units, using confidence measures or time alignment information. See col. 9, lines 23-29.

In contrast, the system according to the invention has a selector connected to said plurality of modules, which routes an input signal to at least one of the modules while excluding the input signal from another of the modules. According to the system of Vysotsky et al., the input signal is supplied to all of the speech recognition units, and depending on the output signals, the arbitrator of the system identifies the best recognition result. The selector according to the invention, has a different task, namely to route the input signal (not the output signal) to one of the recognition modules while excluding the input signal from another of the modules.

In addition to the above, Vysotsky et al. does not suggest a plurality of speech output modules being capable of outputting oral speech, the speech output modules being for respectively different types of speech output. The data processing performed in Vysotsky et al. is not capable of outputting oral speech. Further, there are not a plurality of modules for respectively different types of speech output.

The Examiner's attention is also called to independent claim 19. This claim is directed to communicating with a user using a selected speech recognition module and a selected speech output module. Because Vysotsky et al. does not output oral speech, Vystosky et al. certainly does not disclose communicating with the user via a selected speech recognition module and a selected speech output module.

Like Vysotsky et al., Watts et al. does not suggest a speech processing system comprising a selector that identifies a type needed to process an input signal and routing the input signal to one of the modules based on the type identified in the input signal.

Watts et al. discloses a platform for providing speech services, wherein an incoming telephony channel can be routed to any one of a plurality of speech processors, under the control of a control processor. See Watts et al., claim 1. When one call is being handled by a first speech processor, a further call causes a program loaded in a second speech processor to be replaced with a different program that is selected based on the type of the further call. See Watts et al., claim 4.

Therefore, the control processor selects the next available speech processor. The control processor does not select the speech processor, which has actually loaded the program required for the desired service, and thus is best suited for processing the speech. Because the speech processors are configured randomly depending on the last incoming call routed to the processors. The destination speech processor is likely not the most appropriate speech processor.

The independent claims have been amended to specifically recite that each of the speech recognition modules and each of the speech output modules is respectively constructed specifically for a particular type of speech recognition or speech output. Antecedent basis for these features can be found in the drawings and the original claims. Watts et al. is clear in its definition of "speech processors." The speech processors are not respectively constructed for a particular type of speech recognition and/or speech output. The claims also require that an input signal be routed to one of the modules based on the type identified in the input signal. In Watts et al., there is no connection between how the input signal is routed and the type of speech recognition and/or speech output needed to process the input signal. To the contrary, the input signal is simply routed to the next available processor.

The Examiner cites Watts et al. for "non-parallel processing of the speech signals," See the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. Accordingly, perhaps the Examiner believes that Watts et al. renders obvious eliminating the arbitration step of Vysotsky et al. However, it is not believed that there is any motivation for such a modification. Further, with the modification, Vysotsky et al. may lose the ability to dynamically switch between speaker dependent and speaker independent processing, based on the results obtained. Moreover, even if the modification were made, Vysotsky et al. does not have both speech output and

speech recognition modules (claims 11 and 19), and Vysotsky et al. does not communicate with a user as claimed (claim 19).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the prior art rejection should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 5, 2007

By: _____


Mark J. Henry

Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

In the Office Action at item one, the Examiner objected to the drawings. In order to overcome these objections, replacement figures are submitted herewith.